arXiv:1611.07513v2 [math.CO] 25 Nov 2016

RECENT RESULTS IN ZERO-FORCING OF GRAPHS

ANTÓNIO GIRÃO, GÁBOR MÉSZÁROS, AND STEPHEN G. Z. SMITH

Abstract. We determine the forcing number of complete d-ary trees. With an appropriate extension of the complete binary trees we disprove the conjecture of Gentner and Rautenbach on the size of minimum forcing sets in graphs with maximum degree 3. We characterize all connected graphs on n vertices with forcing number at least $n-2$.

1. Introduction

The Zero Forcing Number of a graph was first introduced by Burgarth and Giovannetti in 2007 [3] and independently by the AIM Minimum Rank - Special Graphs Workgroup in 2008 [1]. The original motivation for the latter came about, due to the problem of bounding the minimum rank of adjacency matrices of a graph, while the former used the model to describe the controllability of certain quantum systems. Despite its beginnings in linear algebra and small applications in physics, the model has received considerable attention from combinatorialists due to its obvious ties to graph theory ([4, 5, 7, 6]).

The Zero Forcing process is a discrete-time process in which we have a set of vertices of a graph G that is initially colored black, while the remaining vertices are colored white. At each time step, the color change rule is applied. Once a vertex has been changed to black, it remains black forever. The process terminates if all of the vertices are colored black in finite time. Otherwise, if there are some white vertices that are unable to be colored in finite time, then we may artificially halt the process.

(António Girão) Department of Pure Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

(Gábor Mészáros) Department of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN

(Stephen G. Z. Smith) Department of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN

E-mail addresses: A.Girao@dpmms.cam.ac.uk, gmszaros@memphis.edu, sgsmith1@memphis.edu.

For the purposes of this paper, the Zero Forcing Process is always on a finite, simple, undirected graph.

Definition 1. *The Color Change Rule states that if u is a white vertex in G, it will be recolored if it is the only white neighbor of some black vertex v. We say that the vertex v forced u to change color.*

Definition 2. *An "Initial Set" or "Forcing Set", is a set of black vertices of G such that, after a finite number of applications of the Color Change Rule, every vertex in G is colored black.*

Definition 3. *The Zero Forcing Number for a graph G, written $Z(G)$ is the minimum cardinality*[1] *of all zero forcing sets of G. In other words, $Z(G) = \min\{|S| : S \subset V(G), S \text{ forces } G\}$.*

In this paper we investigate a few problems and conjectures that have been the focus of study for some time. In Section 2, we give a constructive characterization of graphs on n vertices with forcing number at least $n-2$. We devote Section 3 to the study of the forcing number of trees and determine the forcing number of the complete d-ary trees. Finally, in Section 4, we disprove the conjecture of Gentner and Rautenbach on the maximum size of forcing sets of graphs with maximum degree 3.

We close the introduction with the definition of active and passive vertices as well as a straightforward observation that will be used frequently in our proofs.

Every black vertex u - either part of the initial zero-forcing set or one that was forced during the process - is originally considered passive. If a white vertex v is forced by u, we say that the vertex u became active and will henceforth be considered as an active vertex. Note that "becoming active" is truly a one-time event. That is, no black vertex can force more than one white vertex.

Finally, let H be an induced subgraph of the graph G, and let $N \subset V(H)$ denote the set of vertices with neighbors in $V(G) \backslash V(H)$. The following lemma establishes a bound on the number of black vertices within the induced subgraph H.

Lemma 4. *Let G, H, N be defined as above and let $S \subset V(G)$ a forcing set. Then*

$$|S \cap V(H)| \geq Z(H) - |N|.$$

[1] It is clear there might be distinct forcing sets with minimum cardinality. We shall refer to them as minimum Zero Forcing sets.

Proof. Assume the converse inequality holds for a particular choice of $G, H, N,$ and, S. Observe that $S' = (S \cap V(H)) \cup N$ will be a forcing set in H with $|S'| < Z(H)$, a contradiction. □

2. Characterization of graphs with $Z(G) \geq n - 2$

It was proved in [9] that, for any graph G, $Z(G) = n - 1$ if and only if it is a K_n and $Z(G) = 1$ if and only if it is a path. We continue this investigation by giving a constructive characterization of graphs with $Z(G) \geq n - 2$. We will use the number of vertices contained in the path to refer to its length.

Definition 5. *A graph G is complement reducible* (cograph) *if every induced subgraph of G with at least two vertices is either disconnected or is the complement of a disconnected graph.*

The characterization of cographs as induced P_4-free graphs is a folklore theorem that we use in our later proofs.

Theorem 6. *A graph G is a cograph if and only if it does not contain an induced subgraph isomorphic to P_4.*

Lemma 7. *If G is a graph with an induced path of length at least k then $Z(G) \leq n - k + 1$.*

Proof. Let G be a graph on n vertices with an induced path P_k of length at least k. If we color every vertex of G black except the first $k - 1$ vertices in P_k (that is, $n - k = 1$ vertices in total), G will clearly be forced. □

Remark 8. *Equality in the last lemma may occur. For instance, take a path P_k of length k and a complete graph K_m and connect all vertices of K_m to all vertices of P_k.*

Corollary 9. *A graph G with $Z(G) = n - 2$ is a cograph.*

While the constructive characterization of cographs is well known, observe that not every cograph G on n vertices has forcing number $Z(G) \geq n - 2$. In the next theorem we give a constructive characterization of all connected graphs on n vertices which that property:

Theorem 10. *Every connected graph G with $Z(G) \geq |V(G)| - 2$ can be constructed as follows. Pick two, not necessarily distinct, graphs from the list below and connect all vertices from one to the other.*

i) *K_n;*
ii) *The complement of a K_n;*
iii) *Disjoint union of two complete graphs;*
iv) *A connected graph H on n vertices with forcing number $n-2$.*

Proof. The verification of one direction - namely, that the above operation results in graphs of the required forcing numbers - is fairly straightforward but requires a rather lengthy casework. We leave the detailed verification of the statement to the reader and move to the proof of the converse implication.

By Corollary 9 $V(G)$ can be split into two non-empty disjoint sets A, B such that both $G[A]$ and $G[B]$ are cographs and G contains all edges from A to B. Let us assume $G[A]$ is not connected and has at least 3 connected components, say A_1, A_2, A_3 non-empty. Suppose one of them, say A_1, is not a single vertex. Then it must contain an edge $e = (z, w)$. Let $x \in A_2$, $y \in B$ be any two vertices of A_2 and B respectively, and let $S = \{x, y, z\}$. We claim $V \setminus S$ is a forcing set. Note that any vertex in A_3 will force y, then w will force z and afterwards y forces x which is a contradiction. So if $G[A]$ has at least three connected components all of them must be single vertices and A has the form of ii.

Suppose now $G[A]$ has exactly two connected components, C and D. We need to show both are complete graphs. Assume not, then one of them, say C, has a forcing set S_C of size less or equal to $|C| - 2$. It is easy to check that the set $S = S_C \cup (V(G) \setminus \{x\})$ forces G, for any $x \in B$, which is a contradiction. This implies both C and D must be complete graphs and so A has the form of iii.

If $G[A]$ is a connected set then it must have forcing number greater or equal to $|A| - 2$, because $S \cup B$ is a forcing set of G, for any forcing set S of $G[A]$. Since $G[A]$ has forcing number at least $|A| - 2$ it is either the complete graph or a connected graph with forcing number exactly $|A| - 2$ and so A is either iv or i. The same argument works for B and we are done. □

Remark 11. *It follows easily by induction, and by Theorem 10, that a graph G of order n with $Z(G) = n - 2$ does not have a vertex of degree $n - 1$.*

In [2], the authors asked for a characterization of all connected graphs G satisfying $Z(G) = n - \gamma_c(G)$, where $\gamma_c(G)$ is the smallest size of a connected dominating subgraph of G. By the previous observation, every connected graph with forcing number $n - 2$ satisfies that equality.

3. On the forcing number of complete d-ary trees

For any tree T, let $L(T)$ denote the number of leaves in T. The upper bound $Z(T) \leq L(T) - 1$, originally shown in [1], may be sharp for certain classes of trees (e. g. paths and stars), but may also be very far from the zero-forcing number. For further results pertaining to the relationship between $Z(T)$ and $L(T)$, see [1].

In this section, we determine the zero-forcing number of the complete d-ary trees. Let $T_{d,n}$ denote the complete d-ary tree of depth n on $1 + d + d^2 + \cdots + d^n$ vertices (d^n leaves) and let r_n denote the root of $T_{d,n}$. The study of $Z(T_{d,n})$ in the binary case $d = 2$, for small values, already reveals an intriguing parity-pattern. For a better understanding, we also calculate the forcing number $\widehat{Z}(T_{2,n})$ of $T_{2,n}$ with r_n passive; in this setting a forcing set $S \subseteq V(T_{2,n})$ has to force the tree without the root r_n ever becoming active. In other words, a passive vertex is one that may be forced, but may never force any vertex. Note, however, that r_n once turned to black, may then support further forcing in the tree.

n	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$Z(T_{2,n})$	1	3	5	11	21	43	85
$\widehat{Z}(T_{2,n})$	2	3	6	11	22	43	86

Figure 1. Passive roots only increase the forcing number for odd indexes.

Observe, $Z(T_{2,2n}) = \widehat{Z}(T_{2,2n})$ and $Z(T_{2,2n+1}) + 1 = \widehat{Z}(T_{2,2n+1})$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$. We generalize this observation by an inductive proof. Consider the sequence (t_n^d) defined as follows:

$$t_n^d = \frac{d^{n+1} + (-1)^n}{d+1}.$$

Furthermore, observe that (t_n^d) satisfies the following recursions:

$$t_{2k+1}^d = d \cdot t_{2k}^d - 1,$$
$$t_{2k+2}^d = d \cdot t_{2k+1}^d + 1.$$

We prove the following statement:

Theorem 12.

i) $Z(T_{d,2k}) = \widehat{Z}(d, T_{2k}) = t^d_{2k}$. *There exist forcing sets of size* t^d_{2k} *that contain* r_{2k}.

ii) $Z(T_{2k+1}) = t^d_{2k+1}$ *and* $\widehat{Z}_{2k+1} = t^d_{2k+1} + 1$. *There exists no forcing set of size* t^d_{2k+1} *that contains* r_{2k+1}.

Proof. For a shorthand notation we write T_n and t_n instead of $T_{d,n}$ and t^d_n unless the notation is equivocal. Both statements are obviously true for T_1 and T_2. We prove our claim by induction on n in two steps:

Step 1: $T_{2k} \to T_{2k+1}$

Let $r^1_k, \ldots, r^d_k$ denote the neighbors of r_{2k+1} in T_{2k+1}. These vertices may be viewed as roots of subraphs of T_{2k+1} isomorphic to T_{2k}. We denote these subgraphs by $T^1_{2k}, \ldots, T^d_{2k}$. Obviously, if $S \subseteq V(T_{2k+1})$ is a forcing set, then by Lemma 4, it follows that $|S \cap T^i_{2k}| \geq t_{2n} - 1$. Moreover, we may assume due to symmetry that r_{2k+1} does not force any of the roots $r^1_{2k}, \ldots, r^{d-1}_{2k}$. If $|S \cap T^i_{2k}| = t_{2k} - 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d-1$, that would imply $Z(T_{2k}) \leq t_{2k} - 1$, contradicting the inductive assumption. Thus, $|S| \geq (d-1) \cdot t_{2k} + (t_{2k} - 1) = t_{2k+1}$. In particular, if $|S| = t_{2k+1}$ then $d-1$ of the corresponding subtrees contain exactly t_{2k} vertices, initially colored black, while the one remaining subtree has exactly $t_{2k} - 1$ vertices initially colored black, hence $r_{2k+1} \notin S$.

Equality can be achieved as follows. Let $S_i \subseteq V(T^i_{2k})$ be forcing sets of size t_{2n} containing r^i_{2k} that force T^i_{2k} with their roots passive. Such sets a guaranteed to exist by induction. It is easy to see that

$$\left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{d} S^i_{2k}\right] \setminus \{r^d_{2k}\}$$

is a forcing set of T_{2k+1}. Then r_{2k+1} will get be forced by any neighbor but r^d_{2k}, and afterwards it will force r^d_{2k}. Now, the initial forcing set in T_{2k} together with r^d_{2k} will force the rest of the tree.

Step 2: $T_{2k+1} \to T_{2k+2}$

Let $S \subseteq V(T_{2k+2})$ be a forcing set. We investigate two potential cases: $r_{2k+2} \in S$ and $r_{2k+2} \notin S$.

Case 1: Let $r_{2k+2} \in S$. Observe that in this case $\widehat{Z}(T_{2k+2}) \geq 1+d\cdot Z(T_{2k+1}) = t_{2k+2}$. Also, a minimum forcing set of T^i_{2k+1} does not contain r^i_{2k+1} by induction, thus, even with r_{2k+2} forcing r^i_{2k+1}, the respective subgraph has to contain t_{2k+1} vertices initially colored black, implying $Z(T_{2k+2}) \geq t_{2k+2}$.

Case 2: Let $r_{2k+2} \notin S$ and assume and that it is forced by r^d_{2k+1}. In this case

$$|S \cap V(T^d_{2k+1})| \geq t_{2k+1} + 1$$

since the root r^d_{2k+1} cannot force another vertex in T^d_{2k+1}, implying r^d_{2k+1} is passive. As before, we know that

$$|S \cap V(T^i_{2k+1})| \geq t_{2k+1}, i = 1 \ldots, d-1,$$

hence $|S| \geq (t_{2k+1}+1) + (d-1)\cdot t_{2k+1} = t_{2k+2}$.

Finally, observe that coloring r_{2k+2} black initially, together with arbitrary minimum forcing sets of every T^i_{2k+1}, will result in a forcing set of T_{2k+2} of size t_{2k+2} that forces every vertex, even with r_{2k+2} passive.

□

4. On a conjecture of Gentner and Rautenbach

In [8], Gentner and Rautenbach proved some results about the forcing number of connected graphs depending on the maximum degree Δ. Namely, they prove that $Z(G) \leq \frac{\Delta-2}{\Delta-1}n$ for connected graphs of order n and maximum degree $\Delta \geq 3$, and not one of $\{K_{\Delta+1}, K_{\Delta,\Delta}, K_{\Delta-1,\Delta}, G_1, G_2\}$. For a full proof, and the graphs of G_1 and G_2, see [8]. Furthermore, they prove that if the maximum degree is at most 3, and the girth of the graph is at least 5, then the forcing number is at most $\frac{n}{2} - \frac{n}{24\log_2 n+6} + 2$. Finally, they conjecture that for a graph of order n and $\Delta = 3$, $Z(G) \leq \frac{1}{3}n+2$. Note, that at this point the best upper bound on the zero-forcing of graphs with maximum degree 3 is $Z(G) \leq \frac{1}{2}n + 1$ due to Amos, et. al. [2].

We provide a counter example to the conjecture of Gentner and Rautenbach. We present an infinite family of graphs $\{G_n\}$, with maximum degree 3, such that the forcing number of G_n is at least $\frac{4}{9}|V(G_n)|$.

The aforementioned family can be best described as a recursively constructed binary tree with its leaves substituted by a complete graph on 4 vertices with one of its edges subdivided. Our inductive proof will operate on every second level of the

binary tree; in order to avoid equivocal notation and terminology, we do not follow the notation of the binary tree introduced in section 3, but develop the labeling of the vertices and subgraphs through a recursive approach. Let the graph G_1 be obtained from the complete graph K_4 on 4 vertices by subdividing one of its edges. We denote the vertex of the subdivided edge by x_1 and obtain the graph $\widehat{G}_1$ by attaching a leaf (a new vertex of degree 1) y_1 to x_1. We define a sequence of graphs $\{G_n\}$ and $\{\widehat{G}_n\}$ with labeled vertices $x_n, y_n \in V(G_n)$ recursively. Let G_n^1 and G_n^2 be two copies of $\widehat{G}_n$. We obtain the graph H_n by identifying the vertices $y_n^1 \in G_n^1$ and $y_n^2 \in G_n^2$ and denote the resulting vertex by h_n. Next, let H_n^1 and H_n^2 be two copies of H_n. Note, as these were obtained from previous copies of $\widehat{G}_{n-1}$, both H_n^1 and H_n^2 come equipped with their own y_n. Indeed, we identify $y_n^1 \in H_n^1$ and $y_n^2 \in H_n^2$ with one another and label the newly created vertex by x_{n+1}. Finally, the graph $\widehat{G}_{n+1}$ is defined as above, by attaching a new vertex y_{n+1} of degree one to x_{n+1}.



FIGURE 2. The graphs G_1 (left), and G_2 (right), with $\widehat{G}_1$ and $\widehat{G}_2$ indicated by dashes, respectively.

We prove the following lemma:

Lemma 13. *Let G be a graph with zero-forcing set $P \subset V(G)$ and let $\widehat{G}_n$ be an induced subgraph of G with no edge between $V(G_n)$ and $V(G)\backslash V(G_n)$. Let the sequence t_n be defined as follows: $t_1 = 2$ and $t_{n+1} = 4t_n + 2$.*

i) $|P \cap V(G_n)| \geq t_n$.

ii) *If $|P \cap V(G_n)| = t_n$ then $x_n \notin P$ and $P \cap V(G_n)$ does not force x_n within G_n.*

Proof. Both statements are straightforward for $n = 1$. For the inductive step, observe that if $|P \cap V(G_{n+1})| \leq t_{n+1} - 1 = 4 \cdot t_n + 1$, then we may assume $|V(y_n^1) \cap P| \leq 2 \cdot t_n$. As $|V(G_n^1) \cap P|, |V(G_n^2) \cap P| \geq t_n$, which yields $|V(G_n^1) \cap P| = |V(G_n^2) \cap P| = t_n$ and $y_n^1 \notin P$. By induction, we also know that $x_n^1, x_n^2 \notin P$ and that x_n^i is not forced within $V(G_n^i)$. Note also that y_n^1 is a cut vertex of G thus x_n^1, x_n^2 can only be forced by y_n^1, on the other hand, both vertices are yet unforced neighbors of y_n^1, hence y_n^1 can force neither of them, contradicting our assumption on P. That concludes part i. In addition, we have also proved that $|P \cap V(H_n^i)| \geq 2 \cdot t_n + 1$.

Assume now that $|P \cap V(G_{n+1})| = t_{n+1}$ (that is, $|P \cap V(H_n^i)| = 2 \cdot t_n + 1$) and $x_{n+1} \in P$. Note again that in this case $|\,(V(y_n^1) \cup V(y_n^2)) \cap P| = 4t_n + 1$, thus we may assume $|V(y_n^1) \cap P| \leq 2 \cdot t_n$ and proceed by the reasoning of part i. Finally, suppose that $x_{n+1} \notin P$ but it gets forced within G_{n+1}. As $N_{G_{n+1}}(x_{n+1}) = \{y_n^1, y_n^2\}$, we may assume, due to symmetry, that y_n^1 forced x_{n+1}. We proceed by casework:

a) If $y_n^1 \in P$, then $|P \cap V(G_n^1)| = |P \cap V(G_n^1)| = t_n$. Due to the inductive hyphothesis, neither x_n^1 nor x_n^2 belong to P nor are they forced within their respective subgraphs, thus y_n^1 cannot force x_{n+1} as it has two unforced neighbors throughout the forcing process.

b) If $y_n^1 \notin P$, it must be forced by x_n^1 or x_n^2. Assuming x_n^2 is forced y_n^1 we must have had $|P \cap V(G_n^1)| \geq t_n + 1$. Knowing that

$$\begin{aligned} |P \cap V(G_n^1)| &\geq t_n \\ |P \cap V(G_n^2)| &\geq t_n + 1 \\ |P \cap V(G_n^1)| + |P \cap V(G_n^2)| &= 2 \cdot t_n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

it follows that $|P \cap V(G_n^1)| = t_n$, hence x_n^1 does not belong to P, nor will it be forced within G_n^1. While y_n^2 might indeed be forced by x_n^2 (there exist zero-forcing sets of size $t_n + 1$ in G_n, see Proposition **??**), y_n^1 has two white neighbors (x_n^1, x_{n+1}) thus it cannot force x_{n+1}. That completes our case and our proof.

□

Proposition 14. $Z(G_n) = Z(\widehat{G}_n) = t_n + 1$.

Proof. Lemma 13 implies $Z(G_n), Z(\widehat{G}_n) \geq t_n + 1$. We prove that equality holds by induction on n. In fact, we prove that G_n has a forcing set P_n of size $t_n + 1$ that has the following properties:

a) contains x_n,

b) forces $V(G_n)$ without x_n forcing any of its neighbors.

Such a set can be easily found in G_1. For the inductive steps, we begin with forcing sets of sizes $t_n + 1$ in G_n^1 and G_n^2. It is easy to see that both subgraphs, and thus y_n^1 and x_{n+1}, will be forced (observe that this step requires the forcing to be completed without the active involvement of x_n). Place the same forcing set in one of the copies of G_n. Observe that the appropriate x_n will be forced and will then force y_n^2. Eventually, y_n^2 forces x_n in the other copy of G_n. Assuming we placed $P_n \backslash \{x_n\}$ in that remaining copy, having forced x_n, we now have P_n present that will complete the forcing process in G_{n+1}. In case of $\widehat{G}_{n+1}$ the same forcing is carried out with x_{n+1} forcing y_{n+1}. □

Corollary 15. *There exists an infinite family of graphs $\{G_n\}$ with $\Delta(G_n) = 3$ in which the forcing number of G_n is at least $\frac{4}{9}|V(G_n)|$.*

Proof. Observe that $t_n + 1 = \frac{8 \cdot 4^{n-1}+1}{3}$ and $|V(\widehat{G}_n)| = 6 \cdot 4^{n-1}$, thus $Z(G_n) = \left(\frac{4}{9} + \frac{1}{18 \cdot 4^{n-1}}\right)|V(G)|$. □

5. Acknowledgment

The first author would like to thank Professor Béla Bollobás for inviting him to visit the University of Memphis as well as the University of Memphis itself for its kind hospitality while most of the research has been done.

References

[1] AIM Minimum Rank - Special Graphs Work Group (F. Barioli, W. Barrett, S. Butler, S. M. Cioabă, D. Cvetković, S. M. Fallat, C. Godsil, W. Haemers, L. Hogben, R. Mikkelson, S. Narayan, O. Pryporova, I. Sciriha, W. So, D. Stevanović, H. van der Holst, K. Vander Meulen, and A. Wangsness). *Zero forcing sets and the minimum rank of graphs.* Linear Algebra and its Applications, 428/7: 1628-1648, 2008.

[2] D. Amos, Y. Caro, R. Davila, R. Pepper, *Upper bounds on the k-forcing number of a graph*, Discrete Applied Mathematics 181 (2015) 1-10.

[3] D. Burgarth and V. Giovannetti. *Full control by locally induced relaxation.* Physical Review Letters PRL 99, 100501 (2007).

[4] Y. Caro and R. Pepper. *Dynamic approach to k-forcing.* Theory and Applications of Graphs, Volume 2: Iss. 2, Article 2, 2015.

[5] R. Davila, T. Kalinowski, S. Stephen. *The zero forcing number of graphs with given girth.* arXiv:1611.06557 [math.CO] 22 Nov 2016

[6] R. Davila, F. Kenter, *Bounds for the Zero-Forcing Number of Graphs with Large Girth.*, Theory and Applications of Graphs. Volume 2: Iss. 2, Article 1, 2015

[7] M. Gentner, L. D. Penso, D. Rautenbach, and U. S. Souzab, *Extremal values and bounds for the zero forcing number.* Discrete Applies Math. 214 (2016), 196 -200.

[8] M. Gentner and D. Rautenbach. *Some Bounds on the Zero Forcing Number of a Graph.* Preprint: arXiv:1608.00747v1 [math.CO] 2 Aug 2016

[9] Linda Eroh, Cong X. Kang, Eunjeong Yi, *A Comparison between the Metric Dimension and Zero Forcing Number of Trees and Unicyclic Graphs* . arXiv:1408.5943 [math.CO] 25 Aug 2014